

Maidstone Borough Local Plan Examination: Written Statements in response to Inspector's Matters, Issues and Questions.

Session 12 –Transport and Infrastructure.

Inspector's Question 12.1

Is Highways England now satisfied in respect of the cumulative impact on the M20 of development proposed in the Local Plan?

Council's response:

12.1.1 Since submission of the Local Plan the Council has continued to engage with Highways England (HE) on the matter of the need for more detailed consideration of the impacts of future housing and employment growth on the strategic road network, notably the local junctions for Maidstone of the M20 motorway.

12.1.2 As set out in the situation update dated 3 October 2016, the methodology and assumptions underpinning the junction modelling as set out in document TRA 037 (M20 Junction Assessments Technical Note) have been discussed in detail between the Council and HE (and Kent County Council) and their respective consultants. The "first principles" approach was confirmed as acceptable in an email from Nigel Walkden (HE) to Martina Olley (Mott MacDonald) dated 29 July 2016 (Appendix A), subject to agreement of the distribution of Local Plan development to the four motorway junctions and the approach taken to calculating junction specific TEMPro growth factors for 2016 to 2031. Emails from Nigel Walkden (Highways England) to Paul Goodenough (Maidstone Borough Council) dated 24 August 2016 (Appendix A) stated that the approach taken was considered reasonable and that further comments would be made following receipt of TRA 037.

12.1.3 A draft report was submitted to Highways England on 5 September 2016 with further information provided on 12 September 2016. Detailed technical queries were received by the Council on 3 October 2016. The queries centred around the need for further clarification as to how the junction-specific TEMPro growth factors have been calculated as well as justification for the geometric measurements/input parameters used in the junction models. HE has nevertheless responded positively in respect of the evidence submitted, as an email from Kevin Bown (HE) to Paul Goodenough (Maidstone Borough Council) dated 4 October 2016 indicates (Appendix B). HE stressed at the Transport Modelling Seminar (Session 3A) that their queries are typical for the nature of localised junction modelling which has been undertaken at M20 Junctions 5 to 8.

12.1.4 A meeting between the Council and HE took place immediately following Session 3A to discuss the technical queries raised. It was agreed at that meeting that Mott MacDonald would submit a note to HE providing further clarification of the TEMPro growth factor calculations, as well as a specific response to each of the technical queries received on 3 October 2016. Fundamentally, the former was undertaken on 13 October 2016 and HE confirmed their agreement on 19 October 2016 (Appendix C). The Council is continuing to engage with HE in order to make necessary adjustments to the junction models before they are re-run, with the objective of minimising the required mitigation and agreeing the preliminary proposals. TRA 037 will then be updated accordingly. It is anticipated that this

work will be completed by the first week of November.

Inspector's Question 12.2

Is there a statement of common ground between Highways England and MBC?

Council's response:

12.2.1 Detailed technical queries regarding TRA 037 were received by the Council from Highways England (HE) on 3 October 2016. These comments were considered by the Council's consultants Mott MacDonald in advance of Examination Session 3A.

12.2.2 HE has expressed a preference for a single statement of common ground once all matters have been agreed.

Inspector's Question 12.3

If not, what additional evidence or modifications to the Plan would Highways England wish to see?

Council's response:

12.3.1 The Council believes that this is a question for Highways England to respond to. However, at the time of writing a fundamental step forward has been the agreement which has been reached on the TEMPro growth factors, leaving just the geometric measurements/input parameters for the junction models. HE commented on 4 October 2016 (Appendix B) that the evidence is moving in the right direction and that they see no reason why an agreed statement of common ground cannot be achieved prior to Examination Session 12 or by the end of the programme.

Inspector's Question 12.4

Does the proposed change satisfy the first part of the objection?

Council's response:

12.4.1 The Council believes that this is a question for Highways England to respond to. However, PC/55 makes clear the Council's commitment to ensuring that the impacts on the strategic road network (and local road network) of appropriately located development are mitigated.

Inspector's Question 12.5

Would a cross reference to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (Document SUB 011) satisfy the second part of the objection?

Council's response:

12.5.1 The Council believes that this is a question for Highways England to respond to. However, as the IDP identifies the infrastructure schemes necessary to support proposed

Local Plan development, as well as outlining how and when these will be delivered, the Council considers that a cross reference to the IDP within Policy DM25 would address this issue.

Ref	Proposed Change	Reason
PC/116	At the end of DM25 (1) add: "The Infrastructure Delivery Plan will support the implementation of the Local Plan and outlines how and when necessary infrastructure schemes will be delivered."	To add clarity to the Plan and signpost where relevant information on infrastructure delivery can be located

Inspector's Question 12.6

Would SBC clarify what updating is needed?

Council's response:

12.6.1 The Council believes that this is a question for SBC to respond to. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan contains information regarding the timescales for delivery of individual infrastructure projects, and progress in this regard can be taken into account as the IDP is updated in the future.

Inspector's Question 12.7

Does Highways England have any observations regarding improvements to M2 Junction 5?

Council's response:

12.7.1 The Council believes that this is a question for Highways England to respond to.

Inspector's Question 12.8

Has the impact of Local Plan development on the A249 north of Maidstone been taken into account by MBC and other relevant authorities?

Council's Response:

12.8.1 As part of the localised junction modelling being undertaken by the Council's consultants Mott MacDonald to address Highways England's (HE) holding objection expressed in its Regulation 19 representation to the Local Plan, the impact of consented and non-consented Local Plan development has been assessed for M20 Junction 7. This includes consideration of the A249 approaches to that junction.

12.8.2 A cumulative assessment has been undertaken which takes into account not just Maidstone Borough Local Plan development but also consented and non-consented development set out in the Swale Borough Local Plan Proposed Main Modifications (June 2016). Based on commuting patterns set out in Figure 13 of TRA 037, this has established the number of consented and non-consented households and jobs in Swale that could potentially impact the A249 and in turn M20 Junction 7.

Inspector's Question 12.9

Is there a statement of common ground between KCC and MBC?

Council's response:

12.9.1 Yes, a statement of common ground was signed by KCC and MBC on 14 September 2016 (SUB 019).

Inspector's Question 12.10

Would KCC and MBC please provide an update of their respective positions in the light of the results?

Council's response:

12.10.1 SUB 006 identified two main gaps in the VISUM model evidence as of May 2016, namely that the 2031 Do Minimum (DM) model run reported in TRA 029 had not tested the Local Plan OAN of 18,560 dwellings and that key outputs from the 2022 modelling, undertaken in January/February 2016, had not been reported by KCC/Amey.

12.10.2 Further VISUM modelling work was commissioned by KCC and MBC in May 2016 to address the above gaps. The revised 2031 DM model run is reported within TRA 035 and key outputs from the 2022 model runs are reported within TRA 036.

12.10.3 The further modelling work was considered as part of Session 3A. The Council's position is that the increases in traffic flows and travel time predicted by VISUM for the 2022 DS4b scenario relative to the 2014 base cannot be regarded as significant in the context of the variations in traffic conditions that can typically be expected to occur on a day to day basis. For example, on the A274 Sutton Road and A229 Loose Road AM peak inbound travel times increase by little more than one minute, i.e. 68 seconds and 71 seconds respectively. The level of impact on the highway network cannot therefore be regarded as severe in the context of the NPPF, following mitigation. KCC concurred with this conclusion in paragraph 5.1 of their original report to the 22 February 2016 JTB (Appendix D).

12.10.4 The A274 and A229 corridors have been identified as particularly sensitive to future traffic flow changes, but the 2022 model runs include all allocated sites to the end of the Local Plan period (including all development identified for the South East Strategic Development Location) and the same package of ITS interventions/mitigation measures as for the 2031 model runs, with the exception of SEMSL as the timescales for establishing the justification for and the delivery of such a project would extend beyond 2022. On these two corridors, the 2022 and 2031 model outputs suggest similar traffic flows and travel times in the DS4b scenarios.

12.10.5 It is therefore the Council's position that the conclusions made from the analysis of the 2022 model runs remain valid for the 2031 model runs. The results of scenario 2031 DS4b confirm that the level of impact on the highway network will remain less than severe (i.e. no significant adverse impact on travel times) in the context of the NPPF for the full Local Plan period, with mitigation.

12.10.6 Further, the Statement of Common Ground (SUB 019) confirms that MBC and KCC agree on the principles and mitigation for the period up to 2022 and sets out the agreed list of transport interventions. KCC confirmed during the transport modelling seminar on 6 October that, subject to Cabinet Member sign off, the KCC objection to transport impacts up to 2022 would be formally withdrawn.

12.10.7 The schemes set out in the Statement of Common Ground (SUB 019) are reflected in the VISUM modelling work. They are also reflected in the Local Plan and Integrated Transport Strategy. The schemes are therefore being secured through planning permissions for allocated development sites. In the case of South East Maidstone, given the level of committed development, this process is now substantively complete and the funding is being secured to ensure that the necessary transport interventions can be delivered in a timely manner to support growth.

Inspector's Question 12.11

What is the likely first date by which any Leeds-Langley Relief road could become operational and if a route (and funding) were agreed such that it could be included in the first Local Plan Review, could it realistically be implemented before the end of the Local Plan period?

Council's response:

12.11.1 In the absence of detailed evidence for any relief road at the present time, the Council is unable to comment as to when such a scheme could come forward and believes that this is a question for KCC, as the highway authority, to respond to. However, given the absence of detailed evidence or any prospective funding stream, it is clear that it will not be possible to deliver the scheme before 2022.

Inspector's Question 12.12

How might such a road be funded?

Council's response:

12.12.1 Funding sources for any Leeds-Langley Relief Road are yet to be identified.

12.12.2 The overwhelming majority of development proposed in South East Maidstone is now committed, and no developer contributions have been secured towards such a road. The Council's position is that a Leeds-Langley Relief Road is not necessary to mitigate the impacts of Local Plan growth. Later in the Local Plan period, development is anticipated at the broad locations of Invicta Barracks and Lenham however it is not considered that these proposals will have a significant impact on South East Maidstone, and therefore doubtful whether section 106 contributions could be sought under the CIL tests.

12.12.3 A Leeds-Langley Relief Road is not included within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan Highways and Transportation Schedule and is not included within the Draft Regulation 123 List for funding through the Community Infrastructure Levy.

Inspector's Question 12.13

In the interim, and before a route or funding has been identified for any relief road, should mitigation works be carried out on the existing network to address the impact of development that has already been committed?

Council's response

12.13.1 In regards to the South East Maidstone Strategic Development Location, the planning status of development allocations is as below:

Site Reference	Dwelling numbers	Planning Status
H1 (5)	600	Full permission
H1 (6)	286	Full permission
H1 (7)	250	Resolution to grant outline permission
H1 (8)	440	Awaiting application
H1 (9)	272	Resolution to grant full permission
H1 (10)	800	Resolution to grant outline permission
H1 (27)	90	Resolution to grant outline permission
H1 (28)	112	Resolution to grant outline permission
TOTAL	2850 (of which 2410 committed)	

12.13.2 A cumulative transport assessment (Appendix E and F) was developed by Countryside to support the application for site H1 (10). All of the sites identified in the above table were included in the assessment to establish the cumulative impacts on the transport network, and to confirm the transport measures necessary to support the delivery of the Strategic Development Location as a whole. Through the determination of these planning applications therefore, the cumulative impacts of development on the transport network have been considered in detail and a balanced package of transport improvements have been agreed by the Council's Planning Committee, to address the impacts of planned development.

12.13.3 Significant levels of funding have been secured towards the delivery of these improvements and the Council considers that the measures should be prioritised for delivery to respond appropriately to the impacts of committed development.

12.13.4 The Countryside transport assessment considered the cumulative impact of development on the Wheatsheaf junction and developed a scheme which would mitigate the impacts of planned growth to at least 2029 through the closure of Cranbourne Avenue to one way traffic (a scheme also promoted by KCC at the time). Following the rejection of the scheme by the Maidstone Joint Transportation Board, a revised scheme was developed for the Council's Planning Committee's consideration, as set out in the Urgent Update Report (Appendix G, pages 12 and 13). The modelling work undertaken concludes that, with the introduction of signal optimisation measures to give priority to vehicles through puffin technology at the junction, and a modest level of modal shift (3%), there would be no detriment to the situation with the cumulative development flows added.

12.13.5 Some £108,000 has already been secured towards improvements to the Wheatsheaf junction through an appeal site at Cripple Street (MA/14/503167) and further monies can be directed, if required, from section 106 planning obligations due to be completed shortly for sites H1 (27) and H1 (28) (Appendix H) to achieve the mitigation required.

12.13.6 In regards to the modal shift element, the Heads of Terms agreed by the Council's Planning Committee, in respect of sites H1 (7), H1 (9) and H1 (10) (Appendix I and J), will secure significant developer contributions towards improved bus services to connect the development sites with Maidstone Town Centre and other transport hubs. These developments will together provide some £1.8m to improve the frequency of services along the A274, to connect the development sites to the Town Centre, to Headcorn railway station, and to Maidstone East railway station to connect to the Thameslink service to London. Additionally, a school service will be introduced to provide sustainable transport access to Cornwallis Academy. A further contribution towards bus services, in the region of £900,000, is anticipated from site H1 (8) when that development comes forward.

12.13.7 To ensure a high quality service is provided new bus infrastructure will be installed including new shelters and Real Time Passenger Information and a bus-only route will be provided through the largest sites, H1 (5) and H1 (10), to maximise the effectiveness of the measures. The Council is working constructively with Arriva and the developers to ensure these improvements are delivered in a timely manner to support growth.

12.13.8 Delivery of the schemes will be further supported by robust travel planning measures, including public transport incentives for new residents to facilitate early take up of sustainable transport alternatives to the private car.

12.13.8 Alongside the delivery of significant public transport improvements, the Council has sought to maximise opportunities for walking and cycling to further support modal shift. The Heads of Terms agreed by the Council's Planning Committee in respect of site H1 (10) will provide for the upgrading of a public footpath to the south to provide a cycle link into Maidstone, for connection to the existing cycle route from Park Wood into Maidstone, and a wholly new cycle and pedestrian route through site H1 (10), running east-west, to connect with site H1 (5) and onto Brishing Road and onwards into Maidstone. A Toucan crossing on the A274 has already been secured through site H1 (6) however further crossings will be provided at Rumwood Court and Langley Church to improve safety and accessibility for cyclists and pedestrians. Appendix K provides an illustration of this comprehensive package of measures, as secured through committed development.

12.13.9 In addition to measures to improve the Wheatsheaf junction, and to facilitate a minimum 3% modal shift, a series of other junction improvements have also been secured to address the impacts of planned development. At the junction of the A274 Sutton Road with Willington Street and Wallis Avenue, a widening scheme is identified to increase junction capacity and address the impact of planned development. The Countryside transport assessment, which considers the cumulative impacts, concludes that the scheme would result in large reductions in average delay per vehicle. Some £268,000 is already secured towards the improvements from sites H1 (5) and H1 (6) and the Heads of Terms agreed by the

Council's Planning Committee in respect of sites H1 (7) and H1 (9) will together provide the remaining £1.5m required to deliver the scheme.

12.13.10 The Countryside cumulative transport assessment confirms that further improvements are required at the junction of Loose Road / Armstrong Road / Park Way and at the junction of A20 / Willington Street. The Heads of Terms agreed by the Council's Planning Committee in respect of site H1 (10) will secure pro-rata contributions towards delivery of these schemes with the remaining funding to be secured through proposed allocations at sites H1 (29), H1 (53) and H1 (54) in the case of the former, and from H1 (8) for the latter. Improvements at the junction of Sutton Road / St Saviours Road are to be secured through planning condition.

12.13.11 Site H1 (10) will also provide for the early delivery of works to signalise M20 J7, as set out in the Heads of Terms agreed by the Council's Planning Committee.

12.13.12 The assessment work and outcomes of the Countryside cumulative transport assessment have been subject to full review by transport consultants Mott McDonald, who were commissioned by the Council to undertake an independent appraisal of the work, and to support the decision making process in the absence of constructive input from the Highway Authority.

12.13.13 In respect of the Wheatsheaf junction, the developer for site H1 (29) has provided the results of further modelling assessments of the identified mitigation scheme as part of written submissions to session 6B of the Local Plan examination (Appendix L). The modelling confirms that the mitigation scheme also addresses the cumulative impacts of planned development at Boughton Lane, including H1 (29), H1 (53) and H1 (54) so that there would be no detriment to the situation with the cumulative development flows added.

12.13.14 Site specific highway improvements have also been secured in respect of sites H1 (5), H1 (6) and H1 (7) to provide a new roundabout, new road and road widening scheme respectively (Infrastructure Delivery Plan (SUB 011) refs. HTSE 3, HTSE 4 and HTSE 5).

12.13.15 In summary therefore, the cumulative transport assessment work provides an appropriate assessment of the impacts of planned (predominately committed) development on the local transport network and provides an appropriate basis on which to secure the mitigation necessary to address these impacts. The Council has therefore secured significant funding towards the delivery of the identified schemes which provide a balanced package of measures, with sustainable transport improvements forming a key plank of the approach, in accordance with national policy.

12.13.16 Through the implementation of this package of improvements, which has been agreed by the Council's Planning Committee, it is considered that the transport impacts of planned growth can be satisfactorily addressed. The overwhelming majority of these schemes are also referenced within the Statement of Common Ground (SUB 019) between the Council and the Highway Authority and are agreed as priorities for delivery by 2022. The Council has expended significant resources in developing the necessary evidence base and considers that

these works should now be taken forward and delivered in a timely manner to support growth.

12.13.17 In addition to the above, the Council has sought to deliver bus prioritisation measures along the A274 Sutton Road to further improve the attractiveness and reliability of bus services, and to achieve even greater modal shift away from the private car. This approach is rooted in saved policy T2 of the adopted Maidstone Borough Wide Local Plan 2000, and is also reflected in the adopted Local Transport Plan 3.

12.13.18 Bus prioritisation measures are also a key objective of the new Local Plan, as set out at Policy DM24 Sustainable Transport and at policies H1 (5), H1 (6), H1 (7), H1 (8), H1 (9), H1 (10), H1 (27) and H1 (28).

12.13.19 Some £2.7m was secured towards the implementation of bus priority measures as part of planning permissions granted in 2014 for sites H1 (5) and H1 (6) (Appendix M, N and O) and it is understood that KCC has so far received around £1.3m of these monies from developers. The Heads of Terms agreed by the Council's Planning Committee in respect of sites H1 (7) and H1 (10) will provide a further £1.4m towards the delivery of bus priority measures on the A274 Sutton Road.

12.13.20 Through the development of the Local Plan, the Council has considered a number of options for the delivery of bus prioritisation measures on Sutton Road. KCC have taken the view in consultation responses to the Local Plan however, that the provision of bus priority measures should not be at the expense of private car users. It is considered that, as a minimum, bus prioritisation measures at the key junctions should be introduced, and this is supported by the Mott McDonald A274 Corridor Study (TRA 028) and by information provided to the Council's Planning Committee to inform the decision making process for sites H1 (7), H1 (9) and H1 (10) (Appendix G).

12.13.21 Whilst bus priority is not specifically referenced in the Statement of Common Ground (SUB 019) between the Council and the Highway Authority, the Statement records, at paragraph 2, that the County and Borough Councils agree on the principles and mitigation for the period up to 2022 to include:

24. Bus improvement measures on the A274 Sutton Road from the Willington Street junction to the Wheatsheaf junction;

25. An objective of a typical bus frequency on main radial routes into Maidstone Town Centre.

12.13.22 It is considered therefore that the delivery of bus priority measures is consistent with national policy, reflective of saved Local Plan policies and the adopted Local Transport Plan, and that it is appropriate that the measures be carried forward through the new Local Plan and Integrated Transport Strategy. The Council has secured significant funding towards delivery of a meaningful scheme to further encourage modal shift and considers that these works should now be taken forward and delivered in a timely manner to support growth.

Inspector's Question 12.14

Do the above Representors seek any specific changes to Policy DM24 that relate to their original representations and which they consider are essential to make the policy sound?

Council's response:

12.14.1 The Council believes that this is a question for the Representors to respond to.

Inspector's Question 12.15

Does KCC consider the policy unsound and if so, why?

Council's response:

12.15.1 The Council believes that this is a question for KCC to respond to.

Inspector's Question 12.16

Has the further evidence gathering modified the views of KCC or MBC on this matter?

Council's response:

12.16.1 The further evidence in respect of additional VISUM modelling is not directly relevant to bus priority measures on the A274, and does not affect the Council's position on this matter, as set out in the response to question 12.13.

12.16.2 It is the Council's position that Policy DM25 remains sound. It is consistent with the NPPF and with current KCC transport policy. TRA 028 and Appendix G provide evidence to demonstrate that sensitively designed bus priority measures do not reduce the capacity of junctions and have a minimal impact on general traffic when "overtaking" buses push other vehicles very slightly back in the queue at bus pre-signals, and is far outweighed by the benefit to buses in terms of improved journey time reliability and the resulting transfer of some trips from private car to bus (Q12.17). This will also benefit those people who remain in their cars.

12.16.2 The availability of reliable bus services is essential to promote equal access to employment, services and social opportunities for those without access to a car. These measures will support the Council's objectives for modal shift and improve conditions for all road users.

Inspector's Question 12.17

Is there evidence from elsewhere in Kent or from other areas as to whether bus priority measures result in a shift from cars to buses and has that been factored in to any modelling?

Council's response:

12.17.1 Bus priority measures have been effectively deployed by KCC at various locations within the Maidstone urban area, such as the bus lanes on the A20 London Road and A20

Ashford Road and the Mill Street bus gate adjacent to the Archbishop's Palace. The Maidstone VISUM transport model (TRA 035 and 036), as a highway model with a mode choice option, is unable to model existing or proposed bus priority measures but can model changes to bus routes or frequencies. The modelling in TRA 028 did not take account of any expected modal shift due to bus priority measures.

12.17.2 Nevertheless there are numerous examples from South East England and across the UK of where bus priority measures have contributed to patronage growth, of which some will have been as a result of a shift from car to bus. These include:

- **Fastrack** – the Kent Thameside Fastrack B, operated by Arriva (the main operator of commercial bus services in Maidstone) has involved a comprehensive range of bus infrastructure measures. As well as lengths of dedicated busway, bus lanes, high quality stops with real time information and branding, promotion and marketing have contributed to a 59% increase in adult paying passengers from September 2005 - March 2006 to September 2007 - March 2008¹. It is expected that Fastrack will be extended in line with regeneration and development at Kent Thameside, ultimately leading to a 40km network of busways and priority lanes with four Fastrack routes operating across Kent Thameside after 2025. As the local transport authority, KCC is playing a major role in supporting the development of the network. In particular St Clements Way in Greenhithe is a key part of the Fastrack service. It was resolved at the meeting of KCC's Environment and Transport Cabinet Committee on 4 May 2016 that approval be given to progress to a detail design stage the A226 London Road/A206 St Clements Way Improvement Scheme (item 176)². This scheme includes the provision of new bus lanes in each direction on St Clements Way and is shown as a feasibility design on Drawing No. 4300384/000/05 Rev B.
- **Brighton** – the A270 Lewes Road improvement scheme was completed in December 2014. The scheme included the introduction of dedicated bus lanes on a 4.5km section, together with upgraded bus stops, cycle and pedestrian facilities. Monitoring surveys indicate an increase in bus boardings of 9% since the scheme was implemented, an increase in cycling of 13% and a 15% reduction in general traffic. Journey times for general traffic during the AM and PM peak period have increased by an average of less than one minute. Average bus journey times have increased slightly (by less than 90 seconds), much of which can be attributed to the increase in bus stop boardings. However, punctuality and reliability improvements have been reported by bus operators. The scheme has assisted Brighton and Hove Buses in introducing a new 25X express service which provides quicker journeys for many bus passengers using Lewes Road.
- **Crawley** – the West Sussex Fastway scheme has involved the construction of a bus only link and dedicated bus lanes to serve Crawley and Gatwick. This has been complemented by increased frequencies, new air conditioned buses, next stop audio announcements, peak period services co-ordinated with rail services and live rail departure boards on buses. These improvements have contributed to a 160% increase in bus patronage over 10 years since the first services commenced in September

¹ West Yorkshire Bus Strategy – Appendix E: Evidence of Measures Delivering Bus Patronage Growth. JMP Consultants, June 2016. <http://www.westyorks-ca.gov.uk/uploadedFiles/Content/Transport/Appendix%20E%20-%20Evidence%20of%20measures%20delivering%20patronage%20growth.pdf>

² <https://democracy.kent.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?Cid=831&Mid=6222>

2003¹. In line with this patronage growth, Route 10, the main Fastway route, has increased in frequency from every 10 minutes when introduced to every 6 minutes.

12.17.3 The ability of infrastructure measures such as improved bus services/waiting facilities, bus prioritisation and new/improved walking and cycling routes to effect modal shift can be amplified if they are co-ordinated with travel planning/marketing measures. These can communicate to residents the availability of non-car alternatives for the particular journeys that they make, and the potential cost, time and health benefits of using these alternatives. In Hampshire, the "My Journey" Personalised Travel Planning project undertaken in Andover, Eastleigh and Farnborough during summer 2014 achieved a reduction in single occupancy car journeys amongst participating residents of approximately 10%, based on surveys three months after the delivery of the project. That project solely promoted existing sustainable travel options to residents and so it can reasonably be expected that the impact of travel planning in reducing car travel would be greater if delivered alongside significant new bus and walking/cycling infrastructure as is proposed for south east Maidstone.

Inspector's Question 12.18

If the intention of Policy DM25 is to balance the transport system in favour of sustainable modes why would a scheme which benefitted public transport users but may disadvantage other road users not be consistent with national policy?

Council's response:

12.18.1 It is the Council's position that the bus priority measures proposed for the A274 are fully consistent with paragraph 32 of the NPPF, which states that:

Plans and decisions should take account of whether:

- *the opportunities for sustainable transport modes have been taken up depending on the nature and location of the site, to reduce the need for major transport infrastructure;*
- *safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all people; and*
- *improvements can be undertaken within the transport network that cost effectively limit the significant impacts of the development. Development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe.*

12.18.2 TRA 028 provides evidence that it is possible to deliver sensitively designed bus priority measures, fully funded from developments in south east Maidstone, which support modal shift by providing reliable bus journey times which attract new bus users, many of whom would be making trips which would otherwise be made by car and so would also benefit those people who remain in their cars.

Inspector's Question 12.19

Do the current Local Transport Plan and the development plan currently support bus priority measures and, if so, what weight should they carry?

Council's response:

12.19.1 The preparation of the Local Plan and the now adopted Integrated Transport Strategy (ITS) and Walking and Cycling Strategy (WCS) was undertaken with regard to the current Local Transport Plan (LTP3). The support for bus priority measures (and sustainable transport more generally) in Maidstone is clearly set out in paragraph 8.48 on page 91 of that document. In particular it is stated that:

*The proposed level of development will be underpinned by a package containing a number of traffic management measures **including the enhanced provision and priority of bus services** through the Maidstone Quality Bus Partnership involving the County and Borough Councils along with the town's principal bus operator, Arriva.*

12.19.2 The current LTP3 is the extant transport plan and should carry significant weight given the early stage of development for LTP4. The Council will shortly submit its response to the LTP4 consultation (closing date 30 October 2016) and looks forward to the opportunity for further dialogue with KCC concerning its contents.

12.19.3 Saved Policy T2 of the adopted Maidstone Borough-Wide Local Plan strongly supports the provision of bus priority measures within Maidstone and has had full weight in the determination of planning applications for development proposals coming forward in advance of the adoption of the new Local Plan. The Council considers that the Policy remains NPPF-compliant and further supports the approach to bus prioritisation in the new Local Plan.

Inspector's Question 12.20

If bus priority measures are not introduced how else can traffic impacts of already committed development be adequately mitigated in the present absence of any scheme for a new road?

Council's Response:

12.20.1 The cumulative transport assessment work undertaken confirms that the impacts of planned development (including both committed and allocated sites) can be addressed with the mitigation package set out in the Council's response to question 12.13. This is based on a modal shift of just 3%, provided through a balanced package of measures including junction improvements, improvements to bus services and a series of walking and cycling measures.

12.20.2 In addition to the above package of improvements, the Council has also secured some £4m through section 106 planning obligations towards the delivery of bus prioritisation measures, to further increase the level of modal shift above 3% and towards the targets identified in the Integrated Transport Strategy. Further details are set out in the Council's response to question 12.13.

12.20.3 Further supporting the Council's objectives of increased modal shift, the main commercial bus operator is developing a smartcard and cashless payments which will provide

the opportunity to offer flexible, attractively priced ticketing products which are likely to appeal to existing car users. Alongside this, Action P2 in the adopted Integrated Transport Strategy commits the Council to a 50% increase in long stay car parking charges by 2031. This is likely to increase the attractiveness of bus services as an option for journeys to work in Maidstone town centre and beyond.

Inspector's Question 12.21

Why has MBC reduced or abandoned park and ride schemes and would they not be needed to take full advantage of any bus priority measures?

Council's response:

12.21.1 The Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan consultation (March 2014) included proposals for a new Park and Ride facility at Linton Crossroads on the A229, south of Maidstone, and for increased capacity at an existing Park and Ride Facility near Junction 7 of the M20. The outcome of the consultation was reported to the Council's Strategic Planning, Sustainability and Transportation Committee in September 2015 and the Committee resolved consult on the deletion of the two proposed allocations from the Local Plan.

12.21.2 In respect of the Linton Crossroads site, the Committee report concludes:

"Having assessed and reviewed the representations received at Regulation 18 Consultation stage, it is considered that the provision of a park and ride facility on the Linton Crossroads site whilst appropriate in transport and accessibility terms, would have on balance such a negative impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area, particularly from the lighting which would be situated at the crest of the scarp slope which lied within the proposed Greensand Ridge Areas of Local Landscape Value as to outweigh the transport benefits."

12.21.3 In respect of the Junction 7 site, the Committee report concludes:

"...representations received from the landowner have again made it clear that the site is not available for the intended use. It is therefore recommended that this proposed allocation is also deleted."

12.21.4 The partial Regulation 18 consultation in October 2015 therefore consulted on the deletion of these allocations from the Local Plan.

12.21.5 The Junction 7 site closed in February 2016 and a planning application for a new foodstore was submitted to the Council in May 2016 (MA/16/503863) and is due to be considered by the Council's Planning Committee on 27 October 2016.

12.21.6 Through the development of the Local Plan and Integrated Transport Strategy the Council has engaged with Arriva and KCC to identify measures to improve the frequency and reliability of bus services. Although the loss of the Park and Ride sites is regrettable in transport terms, the Local Plan sets out a series of schemes to improve bus services on key radial routes into Maidstone, including on the A249 Sittingbourne Road, A274 Sutton Road and A229 from Staplehurst, to achieve this key objective of the Local Plan and Integrated Transport Strategy.

12.21.7 Objective 1B of the adopted Integrated Transport Strategy (ITS) seeks to enhance and encourage sustainable travel choices through the “development, maintenance and enhancement of public transport provision, including Park & Ride, encouraging uptake amongst the population”. Paragraph 17.134 of the submitted Local Plan also affirms the Council’s intention to retain the existing Park & Ride sites at Willington Street and London Road.

12.21.8 Although desirable, it is not essential for the introduction of bus priority measures to be accompanied by a dedicated Park & Ride bus service. It is, however, essential that the introduction of bus priority measures is accompanied by frequent high quality conventional urban and inter-urban bus services linking to key destinations and public transport interchanges. By enabling a larger number of people to access frequent bus services closer to their homes, fewer will be obliged to use their cars for at least part of their journey. ITS Actions PT2, PT6, PT7 and PT8 seek to facilitate the delivery of such services. In respect of the South East Maidstone Strategic Development Location specifically, s106 funding is being secured towards the provision of bus services linking rail stations, development sites and Maidstone town centre which will benefit new and existing residents alike.

Inspector’s question 12.22A

Can MBC now provide the supporting evidence to justify the infrastructure priority lists included in Policy ID1, Criterion 4?

Council’s response

Purpose of the priority lists

12.22.1 The Maidstone Borough Plan and Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Viability Study (July 2015) assessed the overall viability of the Local Plan and considered a range of appropriate “development typologies” to establish whether the proposed allocations in the Local Plan were viable. The Study concludes that the Council’s strategy is viable as a whole, and the proposed allocations are sufficiently viable to provide both affordable housing and funding for infrastructure. This overall viability is being evidenced on the ground as proposed allocations receiving planning permission are being delivered whilst making policy compliant contributions towards infrastructure and affordable housing.

12.22.2 Whilst the Council considers that the Local Plan is therefore viable and deliverable, it is recognised however that, in certain circumstances, individual development sites may be affected by specific issues which could threaten viability. In such cases, there may be competing demands for developer contributions through section 106 planning obligations (s106), for instance towards affordable housing or transport infrastructure, and the Council may need to prioritise how any remaining viability headroom is attributed, and to which infrastructure types.

12.22.3 Policy ID1 (4) therefore serves as a guide to the Council’s prioritisation process where these circumstances may arise, and is based on both the Council’s infrastructure

evidence and the key priorities of the Council's Strategic Plan (2015-2020). The Council considers that it is important to retain the lists within Policy ID1.

Origin of the priority lists

12.22.4 To understand the development of the priority lists, it is necessary to trace back some time to the initial work in this area. The summary below outlines how the lists have developed over time.

12.22.5 The Audit Commission's Comprehensive Performance District Report in 2005 identified the need for the Council to clearly identify its priorities in relation to negotiation of planning obligations. On this basis the Council undertook to rank its infrastructure priorities in 2006 and, following consultation with its Planning Committee and Environment and Transportation Overview and Scrutiny in early 2006, the Council's Cabinet agreed the following ranking, taking account of the Council's corporate priorities:

Housing Development

1. Affordable Housing
2. Provision of Open Space and Recreational Land
3. Education Contributions
4. Transportation Infrastructure
5. Medical Provision
6. Community Safety

Business and Retail Development

1. Transportation Infrastructure
2. Open Space / Landscaping
3. Education / Training Contributions
4. Community Safety
5. Clean and Tidy Borough
6. Other

Leisure Development

1. Transport Infrastructure
2. Community Safety
3. Open Space / Landscaping
4. Education / Training Contributions
5. Clean and Tidy Borough
6. Other

12.22.6 In agreeing the priority lists, Cabinet also resolved that a Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) be prepared to provide further guidance on this matter. A s106 discussion paper was then considered by Cabinet in December 2007, and subsequently by the Council's Planning Committee in January 2008 and the Local Development Document Advisory Group in April 2008.

12.22.7 The Council's Planning Committee considered that the ranking of priorities should remain the same, whilst the Local Development Document Advisory Group considered that open space should be given the same ranking as affordable housing for residential development.

12.22.8 In October 2008 however, Cabinet considered a revised Local Development Scheme (LDS) which set out the intention to produce a number of Development Plan Documents (DPDs) and SPDs as part of its Local Development Framework. It was recognised therefore that the work on a Developer Contributions SPD would need to be undertaken alongside development of the proposed Core Strategy, and also noted that legislation introducing the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) was anticipated.

12.22.9 The Planning Act 2008 gained Royal Assent in November 2008 and made provision to enable Regulations to be made to establish the CIL.

12.22.10 The LDS was updated again in June 2009 and confirmed that the approach to s106 / CIL would need to be considered following publication of the CIL Regulations. The 2009 LDS did not set a revised timetable for a Developer Contributions SPD and recognised that any new tariff approach would need to be based on the Core Strategy and supporting infrastructure evidence.

12.22.11 The Council consulted on a Core Strategy in 2011. Proposed Policy CS14 set out the general approach that s106 obligations would be used to deliver site specific infrastructure, whilst a CIL Charging Schedule would be developed to provide funds towards more strategic infrastructure projects. The policy also set out that where developments experienced genuine viability issues, the Council would consider reducing the CIL liability. The policy did not include a list of infrastructure priorities.

12.22.12 The outcomes of the consultation were reported to the Council's Cabinet in March 2013 and it was agreed that the CIL rates should be fixed, and should not be reduced due to viability concerns. It was recognised however that viability issues may arise in some cases, and that this created the need to prioritise infrastructure types based on existing infrastructure deficiencies and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, as part of s106 obligation negotiations.

12.22.13 The Cabinet report stated that "the list of priorities for the negotiation of section 106 planning obligations represents a departure from the list previously agreed by Cabinet in 2006." Principally, this was to ensure that transport infrastructure was given greater importance, given the evidence base of the emerging Local Plan, and also that the importance of public realm infrastructure was recognised, given the Council's strategy for the town centre.

12.22.14 It was considered essential that the lists were re-introduced at this point in time as, at the same Cabinet meeting, the process of lifting the moratorium on greenfield development was begun due to the Council being unable to demonstrate a five year supply of housing.

12.22.15 The following priority lists were therefore included in the Regulation 18 draft Local Plan (2014):

Residential development

1. Affordable housing
2. Transport
3. Open space
4. Public realm
5. Health
6. Education
7. Social services
8. Utilities
9. Libraries
10. Emergency services

Business and retail development

1. Transport
2. Public realm
3. Open space
4. Education
5. Utilities

12.22.16 A number of comments were received on the draft policy, including that the approach of ranking priorities was inflexible. In response, the Council sought to clarify the purpose of the list and the following text was included at Policy ID1 (4) in the Regulation 19 Local Plan, published in March 2016:

“This list serves as a guide to the council’s prioritisation process, although it is recognised that each site and development proposal will bring with it its own issues which could mean that an alternate prioritisation is used.”

12.22.17 The Regulation 19 Local Plan also included “Flood defences” at the bottom of each list in response to specific comments on this issue.

12.22.18 Although fewer comments were received on the policy at Regulation 19 Publication stage, KCC, in particular, made comments to the effect that the priority list was not based on adequate evidence. Given that the supporting evidence documents developed by this point did not address the priority lists, officers recommended a precautionary approach to delete the lists.

12.22.19 Members of the Council’s Strategic Planning, Sustainability and Transportation Committee were however very clear that the lists were an important element of the Local Plan and resolved to retain the lists, with officers instructed to articulate the case for the lists.

Justification for the priority lists

12.22.20 Affordable housing is the Council's first infrastructure priority for residential development. The Council's SHMA identifies a significant level of need for affordable housing in Maidstone and the Council has therefore sought to maximise the potential delivery of affordable housing through the Local Plan.

12.22.21 This is demonstrated in the Maidstone Borough Plan and CIL Viability Study which tests a range of affordable housing requirement options, however the resulting policy DM14 seeks provision of 40% affordable housing in rural areas and 30% affordable housing in urban areas. In maximising affordable housing provision in this way, the remaining headroom for funding other types of infrastructure is reduced. This approach is therefore consistent with the ranking of affordable housing as the first infrastructure priority in s106 negotiations and also reflects the Council's Strategic Plan 2015-2020 priority "planning for sufficient homes to meet our Borough's needs".

12.22.22 Transport infrastructure provision is a fundamental element of the Local Plan and has been a consistent theme throughout the development of the Plan. Traffic congestion is a recognised issue and the need to promote sustainable transport is a key priority. Given the scale of the proposed development and the dispersed spatial strategy, multiple transport infrastructure schemes of varying scales are identified in the Local Plan and the bulk of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan schedules is taken up with transport infrastructure. Its inclusion as second priority for residential development and first priority for retail and commercial development is therefore supported by the Local Plan evidence base. Given the existing situation, in cases where viability becomes an issue, it is therefore considered that transport infrastructure should be accorded due priority. Again, this also reflects the Council's Strategic Plan priority: "securing improvements to the transport infrastructure in our Borough".

12.22.23 The provision and improvement of publically accessible open space is critical to the creation of sustainable communities and is a key priority for the Council. Local Plan policies require that new open space is provided as part of developments or, where this cannot be achieved, either off-site or through developer contributions towards qualitative improvements. In addition, the Council's Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy recognises there are open space deficiencies in some areas and the Council wants to see these addressed, not exacerbated. Although ranked lower than affordable housing and transport infrastructure, open space is a key priority given existing provision, and this is also reflected in a number of the Strategic Plan priorities.

12.22.24 A series of public realm schemes are identified in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan which will provide key improvements to the pedestrian environment within the town centre. The regeneration and improvement of the town centre is a key priority for the Council as this supports Maidstone's role as the County Town and benefits the borough as a whole. Phase 1 of the town centre public realm works has already been completed. The Council's Strategic Plan includes a specific priority "enhancing the appeal of the town centre for everyone" and it is considered important that public realm is afforded due priority in the lists.

12.22.25 The Local Plan sets out a series of policies to require additional capacity to be provided at existing GP surgeries, alongside new development. The provision of and accessibility to health infrastructure, and local GP surgeries in particular, has been a key theme throughout the development of the Local Plan. Many local residents have cited this as a key issue in representations to the Local Plan. The Council has worked with the NHS and West Kent Clinical Commissioning Group to develop a series of schemes to provide additional capacity to accommodate growth, and to improve the accessibility and functionality of services where appropriate. "Encouraging good health and wellbeing" is a key priority in the Council's Strategic Plan and it is therefore considered important that health infrastructure is given due priority in the ID1 ranking.

12.22.26 Similarly to health infrastructure, the Local Plan identifies a series of education infrastructure schemes identified as necessary to support planned growth. The County Council plays a central role in the delivery of education infrastructure and the Council has therefore worked constructively with KCC to develop the education schedule of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. To date, two new primary schools have been secured as part of planning permissions granted on allocated sites and funding is being secured to deliver a range of extensions. Education infrastructure is not directly referenced in the Council's Strategic Plan and, although the need for additional capacity is clearly recognised, given the Council's assessment of existing infrastructure capacity, its ranking position is considered to be appropriate.

12.22.27 The Local Plan does not identify specific schemes for social services, however the Council continues to secure developer contributions towards localised schemes for adult social care, youth services and community learning. KCC's representation to the Regulation 19 Publication Local Plan set out its position on the importance of continued developer contributions towards such infrastructure and this approach is reflected in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. The provision of social services infrastructure supports the Council's Strategic Plan priority to "encourage good health and wellbeing" and it is important therefore that the ranking reflects this, whilst recognising that there are other, more critical, infrastructure requirements.

12.22.28 Utilities infrastructure is essential to the successful delivery of planned development and the provision of services such as water, waste management and power is address in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. In the majority of cases, specific agreements will be negotiated between developers and infrastructure providers to secure relevant services however and it is uncommon for s106 obligations to be used for such infrastructure. Nevertheless, it is considered important to confirm the Council's commitment to the provision of appropriate utilities infrastructure through its position in the ranking, in particular because the adequacy existing infrastructure such as sewerage, has been a key issue through the development of the Local Plan.

12.22.29 Similarly to social services infrastructure, the Local Plan does not identify specific schemes to improve libraries. KCC set out its approach to funding through developer contributions in its Regulation 19 representation and this is reflected in the Infrastructure

Delivery Plan. The Council continues to secure contributions through the development management process to provide small scale improvements, and it is anticipated that this will continue after the Local Plan is adopted. Whilst it is recognised that there are other, more critical infrastructure projects required to support growth, the ranking reflects the need to support libraries alongside the delivery of new development.

12.22.30 The Council has discussed infrastructure requirements with Kent Police and the Fire and Rescue Service throughout the development of the Local Plan, however neither has identified a need for additional emergency services infrastructure to support planned development. The ambulance service has however confirmed the need for a series of Community First Responder schemes across the borough and these are reflected in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Although the infrastructure evidence base confirms a series of more critical infrastructure schemes, it is considered important that emergency services infrastructure is included in the ranking.

12.22.31 Flood defences infrastructure was added to the bottom of each list, following consideration of the responses received at Regulation 18 stage. The Local Plan is supported by a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and sets out a number of policies regarding the need for site flood risk assessments, where appropriate, as part of the development management process. Whilst there are no specific schemes for flood mitigation identified in the Local Plan it is nonetheless considered important that flood infrastructure is included in the ranking.

Summary

12.22.32 The Council's viability evidence base confirms that the Local Plan is viable and deliverable and this is being evidenced through the delivery of development in accordance with policy requirements. It is recognised however that, on occasions, specific issues may threaten viability in some cases and the Council considers it important to set out its priorities for s106 negotiations in these cases. The lists nonetheless are a guide to the Council's priorities, and the policy allows for flexibility to be applied to the priorities where appropriate.

12.22.33 The proposed lists are based on the Local Plan infrastructure evidence base and the Council's Strategic Plan, and have been agreed by Councillors following significant consideration, and over a number of years. Whilst it is understandable that some infrastructure providers may wish to see their own areas of infrastructure given greater priority, the Council must consider these issues in light of the evidence as a whole. It is therefore considered that the lists meet the soundness tests.

Inspector's question 12.23A

Would MBC please comment on the request of the AONB unit to add to the criteria in ID1 (4)?

Council's response

12.23.1 It is important to note that the Council's viability evidence demonstrates that the Local Plan as a whole is viable, and that proposed allocations can be delivered whilst providing the full suite of policy requirements.

12.23.2 Site specific policies for a number of proposed allocations require that developments maintain or improve boundaries and, where necessary, maintain or improve public footpaths. Good examples of this are site policies H1 (42) and (43) which address these issues for development allocations at Lenham, which is in close proximity to the Kent Downs AONB. The Council is therefore confident that such measures will form part of any planning permission granted for these sites.

12.23.3 The provision of publically accessible open space infrastructure is somewhat separate however from these types of measures, and does not, in any case, relate only to the AONB. The proposed change would therefore effectively install a new priority above a range of other infrastructure types, many of which feature heavily in the Council's infrastructure evidence base. It is not considered therefore that the proposed change is necessary or justified.

Inspector's question 12.24

Are any further specific changes suggested to address the matters raised in the above representations and would they be needed for the Plan to be sound?

Council's response

12.24.1 The Council has worked constructively and over an extensive period with infrastructure providers to understand current infrastructure capacity and the need for improvements and additional capacity to accommodate planned growth. The outcomes of this work are reflected in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) and other evidence base documents, and the Local Plan plans positively for the provision of infrastructure necessary to support growth.

12.24.2 The principal reason that changes were proposed at the point of submission was to take account of the latest available infrastructure evidence, including that received through representations to the Regulation 19 Local Plan.

12.24.3 It is not considered that further changes are required to infrastructure requirement policies at this stage. The IDP will be kept under regular review and engagement with infrastructure providers will continue to ensure that necessary infrastructure can be delivered in a timely manner to support growth.

12.24.4 The Council awaits final confirmation from Highways England as to the package of measures proposed to mitigate the impact of the Local Plan on the Strategic Road Network. This being the case, the need for further policy changes to reflect the outcome of this work will be kept under review.

Inspector's question 12.25

Would MBC please respond to the concerns raised about the deliverability of infrastructure in the IDP?

Council's response

12.25.1 The overwhelming majority of infrastructure schemes identified in the IDP do have cost estimates identified. In particular, the key infrastructure schemes necessary to deliver the overall strategy have been subject to extensive work to establish scheme deliverability and cost estimates are therefore included in the IDP. It is not considered proportionate to undertake detailed studies for small scale, site specific mitigation to establish cost estimates for each and every scheme. In many cases, these small scale schemes have already been secured through s106 agreements or s278 agreements, and there is no need to show a cost estimate in these cases. Similarly, it is not necessarily to work up cost estimates for all “desirable” schemes, on which the delivery of the Local Plan does not depend.

12.25.2 The Council is performing well at both securing financial contributions for new infrastructure from development, and delivering, and supporting delivery, of new infrastructure. Key schemes to support the Local Plan strategy such as the Bridges Gyratory improvements and Langley Park Primary School are being delivered, and significant funding through section 106 agreements is secured towards the delivery of necessary infrastructure. The introduction of the CIL will further support the Council in its objectives to deliver infrastructure in a timely fashion to support growth, whilst retaining a significant buffer to ensure that additional site specific infrastructure requirements can be funded through section 106 agreements.

12.25.3 The Council will of course continue to work with infrastructure providers and other key stakeholders to prioritise the delivery of key infrastructure projects which underpin the Local Plan strategy.

Inspector’s question 12.26

Is KCC satisfied with the proposed changes?

Council’s response

12.26.1 The proposed changes to education infrastructure requirements reflect KCC’s representations to the Regulation 19 Publication Local Plan.

Inspector’s question 12.27

What is MBC’s response to the representation?

Council’s response

12.27.1 The provision of new education facilities can provide opportunities for additional community benefits, for instance through the use of school playing fields for wider recreational use at appropriate times of the day. Policy DM23 (3) therefore encourages this “dual use” in cases “where appropriate”.

12.27.2 KCC’s representations to the Regulation 19 Publication Local Plan confirm that the County Council does commission education facilities which also contain facilities for community use and that each site is appraised on its own merits. One such example is the new Langley Park Primary School, located within site H1 (5), which also provides community

facilities, secured through s106 agreement. A similar approach is being taken for site H1 (10).

12.27.3 It is not considered that the proposed Policy in any way conflicts with this position as it places no requirement for dual use on the development, and the appropriateness of dual use can be considered on a case by case basis. Accordingly, the policy is considered to be effective as it encourages consideration of the opportunities for dual community use, so as to maximise the community benefit of new education facilities.